

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 9-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(f), as described in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as described in paragraph 4 of the Office Action. Claims 3 and 8-17 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including the base claim and any intervening claims, as described in paragraph 5 of the Office Action. Claims 1, 5 and 12 are the only independent claims.

It is respectfully submitted that the outstanding rejections of claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are moot, as the claims have been cancelled. Cancellation of claims 1, 2 and 4-7 is not an acquiescence that claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are not patentable over the prior art of record. On the contrary, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the claims in a continuation application.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 2 and 3. Claim 5 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 6, 7 and 8. Claim 12 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 5, as presented in the Response dated February 25, 2004.


In light of paragraph 5 of the Office Action, and in light of the amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4, 5 and 9-17 are now in condition for allowance.

Having fully and completely responded to the Office Action, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

Norio KIMURA et al.

By:   
Thomas D. Robbins  
Registration No. 43,369  
Attorney for Applicants

TDR/jlg  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
July 28, 2004